THE New Republic

Poland, the USSR and the West

An Editorial

Page 3

Civilian Leadership in Space Science

A Proposal by 12 Nuclear Scientists

How Many Worlds?

By FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

S. L. A. Marshall Reviews

Dean Acheson's "Power and Diplomacy"

FEBRUARY 3, 1958

25 cents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Wire

Waiting for S-Day

LIKE KIDS waiting for Christmas Republican Congressmen wait the launching of the first US satellite. They can hardly think, dream or talk about anything else. Believe it or not, GOP radio and TV scripts for Congressmen are already canned and waiting to be released locally simultaneously with the American Sputnik. Glowing interviews are ready for S-Day. Republicans are grimly determined to give it the biggest celebration Madison Avenue ever prepared.

Why? Because they believe the US will lose its so-called "hysteria" when it is proudly listening to an orbiting American Sputnik beep-beeping in the native tongue. They believe—or pretend to believe—that the so-called sense of urgency (and anti-Republicanism) will evaporate. Urgency for education, urgency for defense? Nonsense—not with a US satellite aloft. One satellite won't satisfy nail-chewing Republicans; they want two, four—a dozen. Voters think in symbols, they argue. "Get a satellite up there," they say, "and the heat will be off." They have sat on this hot seat now for 114 days; GOP britches are burning.

It is a strange situation, politicians so much at the mercy of poorly-paid egg-head scientists! Reaction to the first failure in Florida was savage, the more so since the Administration had created the build-up. And will the fickle public really forget its urgency with a satellite? We should know fairly soon now.

These egg-head scientists have their own dry way of looking at things. The idea that you can downgrade education for a generation and then instantly catch up with the Soviet lead by spending a couple of extra billions in a hurry riles them. "It's like thinking you can produce a baby in one month by making nine women pregnant," one of them observed sardonically.

It now looks as though a 1958 Summit meeting were inevitable, but whether this will really solve anything is questionable. Washington debates the matter as the US-USSR sparring goes on—nine-tenths of it propaganda. Will the Soviet yield when it is ahead in missiles? Will the State Department take a more realistic position toward German unification, the Middle East and Red China? The risks are too dreadful not to negotiate, but a Summit meeting of itself is no panacea.

Mr. Facing-Both-Ways

WASHINGTON talked all last week about why Eisenhower went out to Chicago to plead against partisanship in the defense crisis while Sherman Adams simultaneously went to Minnesota to deliver a partisan attack against the Democrats on defense. Walter Lippmann politely asked "how faithfully the President's will is being carried out by those to whom his powers are delegated"—in other words, do the boys bother to tell him any more? Jim Hagerty answered this one by saying, yes, each man had seen the other's contradictory speech. So what?

To us the incident doesn't seem strange. In the 1954 campaign Nixon was the hatchet-man. At a press conference on June 30, Eisenhower praised Nixon as "a very splendid American" but refused to characterize his McCarthy-like speeches. Ike never looked nobler. Next day he sent Nixon a telegram congratulating him for his aid to the GOP —still carefully keeping his own hands out of the gutter.

Substitute Adams for Nixon and the situation is the same. Nixon has become respectable; he is trying to get Democratic Congressional support for the foreign aid bill, and neither he nor Eisenhower can afford to attack. But GOP politicians sullenly demand red meat. Who will give it to them? Why, good old Sherm Adams. This keeps the President on his pedestal while somebody else sticks the pigs. This reporter has recently been re-reading Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. There is a wonderful character in it called "Mr. Facing-both-ways" . . .

Walter Reuther always impresses us. Under a parliamentary system in America he would doubtless be in Labor's cabinet, and he would probably ultimately become prime minister. As it is he is likely to dominate Washington for a few weeks anyway, first before the Kefauver Antitrust Subcommittee where he will show how giant corporations have kept prices up despite falling demand, next as the target of the Republicans before the McClellan Committee. Reuther is generally well able to take care of himself.

Reuther's appearance comes as the recession grows critical. The danger point of 5 percent unemployed has been reached, and now the question is whether the slump will start feeding upon itself. Reuther asked the auto industry last August to cut prices $100 to help meet the situation and promised wage concessions if it did; instead the industry arrogantly raised prices. Failure of the public to come forward and buy high-priced cars (styled like juke boxes) is one of the big disappointments of the business world. Although the steel industry is operating at only about 60 percent capacity it will raise prices next summer, too. There is little connection these days between supply and demand when prices are "administered" by a few gigantic companies.

The Fourth Branch

THE BIG, long-awaited investigation of federal regulatory commissions is trying to get off the ground. This column has frequently cited the importance of this fourth branch of our government. These commissions are supposed to regulate business, but their membership can be manipulated so that they become adjuncts of the very business they are supposed to supervise. How far this has gone is revealed in the first look at the first agency, the Federal Communications Commission. This could be a TV spectacular if the FCC lid were really lifted! Evidence of company gifts to grateful commissioners has made the headlines. These are ignoble but probably not illegal. The real point is that the FCC has not controlled advertising, has not controlled monopoly, has given away the air for private vulgarization and exploitation. They have made a trash dump out of the ether itself.

T.R.B.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic
A JOURNAL OF OPINION

1244 NINETEENTH ST., N.W.
WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

VOL. 138, NO. 5, ISSUE 2255
FEBRUARY 3, 1958

THE WEEK 3
Poland's Role; Ah, Space; Dollars over Minds; Sonnets and Economics; One Percent for the Taxpayers Money

ARTICLES 9
The Superficial Aspect
by Gerald W. Johnson
For Civilian Leadership in the Space Age
How Many Worlds?
by Frederick L. Schuman

BOOKS 17

THEATRE 21

GILBERT A. HARRISON, *Editor & Publisher*
MICHAEL STRAIGHT, *Editor-at-Large*
HELEN FULLER, *Managing Editor*
SELIG S. HARRISON, *Associate Editor*
ROBERT EVETT, *Book & Music Editor*
F. R. Ruskin, *Asst. to the Publisher*
Contributing Editors: Alexander M. Bickel, Frank Getlein, B. H. Haggin, Irving Howe, Gerald W. Johnson, James E. King, Jr., Donald Malcolm, Helen Hill Miller

Published weekly (except for omissions of four summer issues) and distributed to newsstands by the Eastern News Company, N. Y. 14, N. Y. Phone: REpublic 7-8656. Entered as second-class matter September 26, 1950, at the post office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Single copy, 25¢; Yearly subscription, $8.00; Foreign, $9.00. Armed Forces personnel or students, $5.00. Subscribers desiring change of address should notify us at least three weeks in advance. Please include both old and new addresses. Copyright, 1958, by Harrison-Blaine, Inc.

Correspondence

► *Teaching the Teachers*

SIRS:

AS ONE who has been engaged in school administration and who has taught (not *only* Education courses but Sociology as well) in teachers colleges, I must say that David Stevenson's article (*NR*, Jan. 13, 1957)—typically in a circumstance of this kind—contains some

(Continued on page 22)

Poland's Role

HOW FAR is Gomulka's Poland today still capable of a degree of independent initiative within the common framework of Soviet-bloc foreign policy? And how far is it in the Western interest to encourage such relative independence? Both the discussion among the NATO powers about the so-called "Rapacki Plan"—the Soviet-endorsed Polish proposal for a zone free from nuclear weapons in Central Europe—and the speculation about the surprise meeting between Khrushchev and Gomulka in the forests bordering Poland's eastern frontier have given these questions a new topical interest.

There is not much difficulty about interpreting the Rapacki Plan as it stands. Either it would deprive the NATO forces in West Germany of tactical nuclear support in the face of much larger Soviet-bloc forces, and would thus give the Russians a military advantage without their paying the political price of real "disengagement" from satellite Europe; or the NATO forces in West Germany (and the Soviet forces in the East) could still rely on tactical A-bombs carried by planes based west of the Rhine and east of the Bug, and then the scheme would make hardly any difference at all. The Soviets clearly aim at the first, and also at the exclusion of Western IRBM bases from all forward areas; for that purpose, they have already made parallel proposals for Italy and Albania and for the Middle East, while carefully excluding Hungary, where some of their own forward-launching sites are believed to be based. So far, the negative attitude taken by Chancellor Adenauer is fully justified.

But does the plan mean the same thing to the Poles? Imagine a sincere Polish patriot, anxious to get rid peacefully of the Soviet troops and of his country's encirclement by Russians and Russian-run East Germans. If such a man could influence his country's foreign policy in present conditions, would he not put forward something very like the Rapacki Plan—so as to get Soviet consent for a proposal which by its nature would open the door to a discussion of wider ideas of disengagement? And would not the West be wise to take up the proposal—as the British Government, for instance, seems inclined to take it up—in this spirit, not as acceptable in itself, but as raising a topic worthy of serious diplomatic exploration?

In answering this question, much depends evidently on whether we really believe that such independent motives are still at work in Poland behind the façade of Soviet-bloc solidarity. On the whole, the evidence seems to favor that view. Mr. Gomulka seems to have been a most reluctant signatory of the Moscow 12-party declaration, accepting it after many amendments only when abandoned by his erstwhile Chinese protectors and completely isolated in the face of Soviet pressure; he has not used the "verification of party membership" for the wholesale purge of "revisionists" which Moscow clearly expected of him; and he has generally stuck to the principle that, whatever theoretical formula is agreed upon internationally, he must remain judge of how to apply it in his internal affairs.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the foreign field Poland's relations with Israel remain noticeably different from the attitudes of other Soviet-bloc countries, and so remains the tone of most Polish polemics against the West. The Soviet decision to grant no new economic aid to Poland now that the most immediate crisis which followed the Hungarian revolt is over, conveyed at the November meeting, has hit the Polish régime's most sensitive spot, but has made no apparent difference to its resolution.

Moreover, Poland's continued relative independence is only the most important example of a wider problem which still faces the Soviet leaders. At last November's conference of Communist Parties they were not content with condemning "revisionist" heresies; emboldened by Mao's remarkably humble support, they reaffirmed the principle of Soviet leadership in terms which amounted to the first clear rejection of the doctrine of "polycentrism," *i.e.* of effective autonomy for all major Communist Parties, and belittled the formula of "various roads to socialism" to which they had subscribed in Belgrade and at the 20th Congress. In doing this, they seem to have overestimated the degree to which the Sputniks had restored their ideological authority, at least in Europe. For while such unrepentant Stalinists as the French, Czech and East German Communist Parties have hailed the result as a triumph of their views, the Yugoslavs protested and have now resumed the argument in favor of full national autonomy for Communist Parties; the Italian inventors of "polycentrism" have preserved a stony silence; the American Party has provisionally rejected the Moscow declaration; while in Hungary, the bitter struggle between the old Stalinists who want to try Imre Nagy as a traitor not only for his role in the revolution but for his previous struggle for national autonomy, and the Kadar group, whose leaders were once on Nagy's side and would like to regain some popularity by concessions to the people, has flared up again.

In this continued struggle for the degree of Soviet control within the bloc the role of Poland is crucial, and there is one vital field where Polish independent policies may even have repercussions on the Soviet Union itself. That field is agricultural policy, the Achilles heel of the Soviet system and of Mr. Khrushchev's personal rule. Nowhere more than here has Gomulka's new course been so spectacularly successful, nowhere is it so integrally preserved. The disbanding of most collective farms, the whittling down of forced deliveries, the spreading sale of state land to individual peasants and the selling of the machine parks of the Tractor Stations have resulted in a great improvement in food production and have practically ended party control in the Polish countryside. Yet during the same year, the Soviet grain harvest has fallen to two-thirds of the 1956 level, back to little above prewar, owing to a catastrophic drought in Mr. Khrushchev's ploughed-up steppe lands which spread to some of the older grain areas on the Volga as well. In the light of his Minsk speech last week, proposing the gradual elimination of Tractor Stations in the Soviet Union, we can conclude that the comparison must have appeared dangerous to Khrushchev. Yet odious comparisons of this kind are clearly inseparable from effective control of national autonomy in internal affairs. It seems a fair guess that the Khrushchev-Gomulka talks in the forest were concerned at least as much with these problems as with the Rapacki Plan—especially as Mr. Khrushchev took time off on his return journey to visit some kolkhozes in neighboring Byelorussia.

In the circumstances, we should clearly be wise to miss no opportunity for keeping in diplomatic contact with the Polish régime, for encouraging it in playing a role of relative independence, and for helping to alleviate its economic difficulties—not in order to break up the Soviet-Polish alliance, which is geographically impossible while the present partition of Europe lasts, but in order to strengthen the forces of change within the Soviet bloc against the forces of rigidity. In talking loosely of a vast conference of "capitalist and socialist states" the Soviet leaders have hinted that they would also accept a more limited forum, but would not return to conferences where they are outnumbered by three or four to one. When the time comes to take them at their word, we should make sure that the next government to participate on their side is that of Poland.

Ah, Space

RECENTLY on TV we heard an inquiring reporter ask an astronomer whether his visual journeys among the light-years and galaxies didn't give him an uncomfortable feeling of man's insignificance. His reply fascinated us. He said that, on the contrary, the lesson of modern science is that man is really at the middle of things. For example, he explained, in terms of mass, if you start with the smallest identified unit of matter and run through all the galaxies to the boundaries of the cosmos itself, you find that the human body ranks about halfway. (We have to admit that his logic shook us a bit.) Moreover, our sun is a middle-sized star not too far from the center of a middle-sized galaxy not too far from the center of known space. So, there you have it. Copernicus was wrong after all, the universe *is* anthropocentric, and Man the monarch of all he surveys. A sort of middle-class monarch in a bourgeois cosmos. We'll bet our bottom dollar that THE individual man at the dead center of all this wonder is an astro-physicist from Muncie, Indiana.

Anyway, the new confidence of the natural scientists (except the under-privileged biologists, who can't even get good Civil Service ratings) is a thing to behold. We recall that Copernicus and Galileo had a hot time

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of it for presuming to lower man's place in creation just when the poor animal was creating the new humanism and exploring the globe. We are now tempted to wonder whether this restored cosmic dignity we owe to more sophisticated science may not be the prelude to an area of cosmic complacency. There is some evidence for it, certainly, when democratic values run to higher tailfins on longer automobiles and the midwinter vacation. Even Mr. Khrushchev, with all his stoic determination to uphold Lenin's discipline and purpose is having to build houses for Russian workers. But three leading Democratic advocates of "crashing" our way into space—Senators Lyndon Johnson and Clinton Anderson and Rep. Chet Holified—reassure us.

☆

Three rather grand ideas are at play. First, we are told, we, the people of the United States, must beat the Russians into space because those who get there first will rule the laggards. They'll be able to see everything (no more military secrets), hit anything with hydrogen bombs (no more national security), even control the weather. Of course, there are a few technical problems. (Such as what power-source for our TV satellite? And, won't it be easier to shoot down satellites than to get an H-bomb into an orbit and then bring it down accurately at some later date? And whose weather, anyway?) But aside from all this, we're hard to convince that our military problems won't continue to be grubbily earthbound for a mighty long time—ICBM's are only transients in space. What happens, then, if we go orbiting off into the unknown and neglect them?

The second idea is that the challenge of space is too big for any one people and ought to be a joint effort of all humanity. There is in this the nub of a grand idea the astronauts have had for a long time: we can resolve our niggling earthly differences in a joint assault upon the cosmos. What it comes down to, though, is that the UN should coordinate an international program of space exploration and control in which the Russians and ourselves will be the major participants. We can just imagine Congress voting two-thirds of the billions required to colonize Mars so the Asian-African bloc can elect a Russian (or, heaven help us, an Indian) as proconsul to run the place. The third idea is somewhat more pedestrian, having been advanced by the Administration. It is that since we've apparently *got* to find something we can negotiate with the Russians, here it is. But we'd better hurry, because when claims have been staked out on the Moon our rivalries will have taken leave of the Earth's surface and it will be too late—as it is too late now to negotiate control of the atomic nucleus.

We don't mean to ridicule all these flights of imagination, but we'd like to see some concrete beginnings. (For some proposals by Los Alamos nuclear scientists, see page 10.) And we'd hate to see the real promise of broadened understanding lost in a Sunday-supplement sort of distortion of what there is on which understanding can be reached. The space lawyers seem to us—forgive the paradox—to have kept their feet on the ground in all this. There *is* a problem when satellites wing their way over heads that weren't asked permission for their passage. And the elements of space law are at hand, by using the analogy of the high seas and by adopting some elementary and recognizable physical upper boundary of the atmosphere. These suggest the kinds of practical rules the Russians can understand and have, in the past, obeyed. We could go on to some kind of UN-sponsored joint program of information interchange and task allocation, perhaps on the model of the Geophysical Year, one that might—that just might—lay the groundwork for later international projects of space exploration and perhaps even help to keep the bugaboo of space "control" under control.

On the purely defense side of things we confess to complete skepticism. We honestly don't think that anything that can be called "control" of space is going to turn up for many, many years to come. Operations in space may well contribute tangentially to military power. We certainly cannot take the chance that they won't. But old Mother Earth is going to be "controlled," if at all, from her own surface for a long time. The regulation of ballistic missiles, then, is just another armaments control question. And we don't see much being done about it until the political causes of tension are reduced. Maybe there *is* hope if mankind lifts its glance above the horizon, to the Moon and beyond, but until we see the effects of the new vision on the birth and industrial productivity rates of the underdeveloped countries, and until the singing spheres begin to be echoed in a new ideological harmony here below, we still shall not expect to awake one day and find that our bitter problems have gone spiraling off over the new horizon.

Dollars over Minds

IT SEEMS incredible that the President has proposed funds for the program of the US Office of Education in fiscal 1959, Sputnik and all, of only $325 million, less than half the $670 million proposed a year ago for fiscal 1958. Increasing funds for the National Science Foundation from $40 million to $140 million helps in that specialized area but does little for the vast money-starved body of American education. There is plenty of evidence that the Bureau of the Budget browbeat the Department of Health, Education and Welfare into lowering its initial sights and submitting a program which is obviously not seriously designed to do the job demanded.

Consider scholarships. The proposed $7.5 million to be awarded on the basis of student ability and family need would provide aid of $750 per year to a maximum

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of only 10,000 students. This is fine in principle, but the limited approach means that even if the 10,000 scholarships should be distributed one to a school (and they will not be—the better and usually the larger schools will dominate), something like 12,000 senior high schools would not get a single scholarship. More sensible goals have been proposed by the National Education Association and the American Council on Education, which have recommended 20,000 to 25,000 awards, and by Sen. Lister Hill and Rep. Carl Elliott (Ala.), now engaged in writing what may turn out to be the Democratic blueprint for education, who have called for 40,000 scholarships.

Far more serious, however, is the Administration's refusal to recognize the plight of the colleges and universities faced as they are with the responsibility for beefing up the quality of their product at the same time they prepare for an estimated doubling of enrollment, from the present 3 million to some 6 million students, by 1970. How are the institutions to pay for the dormitories, classrooms and laboratories? How are they to pay the additional faculty members required, and the *better* faculty to do the tougher and more skillful teaching that everybody is calling for? The Administration offers little but lectures about the responsibilities of the "local communities and the states." A few of these are contributing as generously as should be expected, as are many individuals, foundations and industries, but no source of support except the federal government is adequate for the massive education effort now required.

☆

The American Council on Education, which speaks for most of higher education, has proposed that there be a federal cost-of-education payment of $500 to each institution enrolling the recipient of a federal scholarship, and a payment of $1,000 to each institution enrolling a federal graduate fellow. The Council also proposes continuance of the successful College Housing Loan Program and that there be established a new program of assistance to the colleges for construction of academic facilities, with the choice of (1) grants to defray up to 50 percent of construction cost, or (2) low interest 40-year loans to finance such construction, as in the College Housing Program, backed by the general financial resources and prospects of the institutions. The President in his special message on education offered no program for academic facilities. On the contrary he recommended abandonment of the effective College Housing Loan Program in favor of private financing, no doubt under pressure from investment bankers who shudder at the precedent this kind of lending could establish.

While there is basis for hope that the Democrats will come forward with a realistic program for education, its enactment remains seriously in doubt. The Administration patently resists action geared to the needs. The issues of segregation, and separation of church and state, are formidable obstacles on both sides of the aisle. But most formidable of all, it seems clear that the preference for dollars-over-minds which dominated so much of the nation's thinking for so long a time before Sputnik is still very much with us.

Sonnets and Economics

AMONG poets, the exigencies of the sonnet as a verse form are professionally recognized: the man who can convey his meaning and still meet its requirements of rhyme and cadence is a stout fellow. Equal recognition is accorded by economists of all tendencies and all political affiliations to the exigencies of the annual Economic Report as a form of expression in their metier.

Both a sonnet and an Economic Report permit dividing the material into two groups, and the sounds with which the lines end are permitted to vary from one to the other. In an Economic Report, the opening of every section must be soothingly buoyant; later on, if there is something unpleasant that really must be said, it can be covered. To give the political necessities their primacy and their due, and yet to place the essential economic facts where they can subsequently be quoted, requires a skill and a cynicism which fellow practitioners of the politico-economic arts should appreciate. And for our culture to be broadly sophisticated, an equal understanding of the report as an art form should be encouraged among the public at large. To this end, the following pairs of illustrations are offered from this year's document:

Page 10: The year 1957 was a prosperous one, despite the decline in the final quarter. Economic expansion continued, though at a lower rate. Production, employment, and income again attained record levels. For the year as a whole, gross national product amounted to $434 billion and personal income to $343 billion, both some 5 percent above 1956.

Page 11: The rise of expenditures and incomes in the latter part of 1956 and most of 1957 was largely matched by an increase in prices. The physical output of goods and services rose only slightly, and throughout 1957 industrial output remained below the peak registered in December, 1956. [Industrial Production, shown as the last item of the table on p. 10, shows a percentage change from 1956 to 1957 of zero, while that from 1955 to 1956 was 2.9.]

* * *

Page iv: At the turn of the year, the economy was beginning to feel the effects of an acceleration of the placement of defense contract awards, prompted by the need to move forward quickly with programs essential to the strengthening of the Nation's defenses.

Page 12: The sharp advance in national security outlays ended in the second quarter. . . .

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

* * *

Page 67: American agriculture is basically strong. The transformation in farm technology has been raising output per man-hour more rapidly in agriculture than in manufacturing. Family farms remain the dominant form of agricultural operation, and the proportion of farms that are owner-operated has never been higher.

Page 67: Recent declines in the number of farms have been heaviest among those too small to provide an adequate level of living from agriculture alone. . . . Farm families have notably improved their levels of living during the last decade and a half, and this improvement continued even when income from farming alone was declining.

AWKWARD ATTITUDE

***"Let's throw back our shoulders and stand proudly erect . . . let's thrust out our chins."*—THE PRESIDENT at a Republican fund-raising dinner, Jan. 21.**

IF you can raise your head when all about you
Are shaking theirs and calling you a flop,
And never turn a hair when others doubt you
Will ever make a comeback to the top;
If your deportment shows the will to win out,
No matter what the temporary check,
And you can set your jaw and thrust your chin out,
Which will prevent your sticking out your neck,

If you can dig your toes in, square your shoulders,
Inevitably chucking out your chest,
So that your martial bearing tells beholders
Reserves of strength are yours, to meet the test;
If you can keep your posture firm and steady,
Look down your nose and stare them in the eyes
To indicate that foes will find you ready,
And you will stand no nonsense from Allies,

If, radiating confidence and vigour,
You tense your muscles while you clench your fists,
And either keep your fingers on the trigger
Or snap them at faint-hearted pessimists;
If you can dig your hands into your pockets
While standing with a poker down your back,
And swell the funds for Party bombs and rockets,
And never weary, stagger or relax,

If you can make men understand your meaning,
Though through clenched teeth you cannot speak at all,
With both feet on the ground, and never leaning,
Or wishing to, against the nearest wall,
If, shoulders back, and chest and chin extended,
You stand on guard until relieved, and if
You don't crack up, my son, before it's ended,
You'll certainly be feeling mighty stiff.

SAGITTARIUS

One Percent for the Taxpayers Money

THE PEOPLE of most US states get it both coming and going from tight money and high interest rates. They continuously have to pay more to borrow, either privately or for public purposes; but they are still putting many millions of dollars of inactive state funds into long-term deposits in banks, for which the latter pay low rates of interest or none at all.

In such states—and they constitute the large majority—the bankers are still riding the gravy-train even while chronically-pinched state treasuries and legislatures look everywhere for more money to meet the rising cost of government, and reluctantly discuss imposing new taxes, though ignoring a source of funds right under their noses. Nationally, billions of dollars are still held by banks in such state deposits, on which they reap many millions of dollars yearly at the expense of taxpayers.

One state has revolted. In Colorado Governor Stephen L. R. McNichols and State Treasurer Homer F. Bedford told the 142 banks holding $27 million in long-term state deposits that the money would be withdrawn as contracts expire, and loaned to the US Government instead. The reason:

The state is now getting only one percent yearly on most of this money, which it must agree to leave in the bank for a year; one and one-half percent on a small fraction of it, which must be left for two years. Meanwhile federal interest rates have gone to such a height that even the government's 91-day bills pay up to three percent, or even more. The new policies mean at least $500,000 more yearly for Colorado, which like most states is hard pressed for more revenue.

More recently the Colorado officials have relented to the extent of saying that banks that will pay three percent can keep their state time deposits; but this did not satisfy the state bankers' association, which is not willing to pay more than two percent, but argues that the money would be more usefully employed in Colorado, than if loaned by the state to the federal government. So far the state officials are standing firm.

The situation in which most states get little or nothing for their time or "savings" deposits of many millions of dollars in banks is anachronistic. Hundreds of state subdivisions and other public agencies—cities, counties, school districts, highway departments, water departments and districts, welfare and pension departments, etc.—have worked out thrifty means of handling money they cannot spend at once, as when the proceeds of a bond issue can only be paid out to contractors over several years of a building program. Their treasurers so handle the extra money as to "earn its keep," or almost so; and in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some instances, when it was borrowed before recent high interest rates, a little more so.

One means of keeping such money at work is by buying the ubiquitous short-term federal issues, including the government's 91-day bills which enable local officials to keep their money working when idle for even three months. Thus such local officials make high interest rates work for taxpayers as well as against them.

Most such public agencies are allowed by law to invest their temporarily-inactive money, as contrasted with the situation in many states. Where such an agency is being "gypped" in interest rates, it is not due to law. For example, in 1955 a new three-member Transit Authority took over in New York City. E. Vincent Curtayne, the Authority member in charge of finances and himself a banker, found that the Authority had $16,125,000 in time deposits in banks which were paying only one percent interest. He also found an inordinately-large drawing account that was producing no revenue at all. "This is ridiculous," he said to himself, and by May, 1957, had $25,396,000 in time deposits drawing three percent interest—or $761,895 yearly, rather than the $161,250 yearly earned by the old Authority, a difference of $600,000 in favor of the taxpayers. Mr. Curtayne said that all it took was a few telephone calls.

States have found it different. Missouri was constitutionally prohibited from 1933 until 1956 from earning interest on any state deposits in banks. In the 1956 election the voters adopted a constitutional provision that made it possible for the state to charge interest.

But the bankers persuaded the legislature to adopt an enabling act that limits to 30 days the time the state might agree to leave its funds in banks—and by federal law, interest on 30-day deposits is restricted to one percent yearly. The state expects eventually to put about $50 million in such deposits on which it will earn $500,000 yearly, as against nothing before; but it could earn $1.5 million or more on the same amount in federal securities, into which some of its inactive money is going.

THE Missouri situation approached the ridiculous in the autumn of 1957 when the state found no takers for $30 million of highway bonds, upon which by law it could pay no more than three percent interest; nor sell at less than par. So the state legislature had to meet to provide that such bonds could be sold for less than par, an effective way of raising the interest rates it would have to pay, even while lending millions of dollars of its own money at one percent!

Kansas had a somewhat similar experience. Like many other states it collected interest on time deposits before the depression, and from 1905 to 1938 the state earned $3.4 million for taxpayers by this means. In 1937, however, "to help the banks," the legislature forbade collecting interest on any state deposits. By 1956 the state had $78 million in time deposits in nearly 600 banks, on which it was drawing no interest at all. The Legislative Council, ordered by the legislature to look into the matter, reported that even at one percent interest, the taxpayers would have earned more than $6 million during the interim, and at 2.5 percent interest even then being earned by some states on inactive accounts, they would have earned $15.3 million.

The Council recommended a law under which the state would have charged for inactive deposits one-half the interest rate on federal issues of more than one year but less than two years' duration, thus tying the state's earnings to the money market; but even so leaving the bankers a handsome margin.

The latter, however, fielded this one deftly too. Under the actual resulting 1957 law, the state can withdraw upon demand 20 percent of its inactive deposit in any bank, but cannot charge interest thereon. The remainder, or 80 percent, is deposited for one year—with a 60-day withdrawal notice—and unless the state serves notice of withdrawal, the agreement is automatically renewed each 12 months. Upon this 80 percent the state collects one percent; or an effective rate on the whole deposit limited to four-fifths of one percent. The legislature granted the state no power to withdraw this money and put it into short-term federal securities, as originally proposed.

Kansas as of Sept. 30, 1957, had $70,823,780 in inactive accounts. Of this, $14,164,756 or 20 percent was drawing no interest. On the remainder, or $56,659,024, the state was earning one percent interest yearly, or $566,590. Kansas taxpayers are that much better off than with no interest at all, but at three percent on the whole amount, they would be earning better than $2.1 million yearly. So Kansas bankers have retained a handsome amount of down, or more than $1.5 million yearly, with which to feather their nests.

Of course, and without saying that it now prevails in any state, the power of state treasurers or other officials to put huge sums of inactive money in banks at low interest or no interest, can lead to "sweethearting" in which state officials can do favors for banks, and receive political support or other favors in return. Such a situation prevailed in New Jersey before the Meyner administration came in to clean it up; and much "sweethearting" was disclosed by the Hodge scandals in Illinois.

In 1956 the Kansas Legislative Council queried the treasurers of all states as to state law and practice regarding inactive accounts, and disclosed an amazing variety. Some states were still forbidden by law or constitution to earn any money whatsoever on state deposits, others were earning as high as 2.5 percent. However, the bankers of most states still appear to be reaping a harvest aggregating many millions of dollars yearly from these antiquated and inflexible provisions, and will keep on doing so as long as taxpayers are kept in ignorance of their own tenderness to the banking fraternity.

ROSCOE *and* WILLIAM N. FLEMING

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Superficial Aspect

Virtue's Profit

WHEN A MAN or a group perpetrates a villainy and gains profit and praise thereby, a wrong is done to every honest man. Everybody understands this. But when a man or a group does a good deed, and it is met with silence or damned with faint praise, another wrong is done every honest man.

This some people deny. Virtue, they say, is its own reward and a clear conscience is ample compensation for rectitude. Which is baloney.

The point is of contemporary interest by reason of the marked restraint shown by the public prints in praising the leadership of the AFL-CIO for throwing out the Teamsters and other unions guilty of practices tainted with corruption. The press generally concedes that they did the right thing, but usually intimates that there was small merit in it because they had to do it to avert a scourging at the hands of the law-makers.

They didn't have to do it. They could, and John L. Lewis says they should, have weasled out of it. When it is a matter of retaining an income of a million dollars a year, any second-class law student can produce one specious argument to justify it, and really learned counsel can produce 30. If you are willing to live as a self-constituted love-child there are always excuses to be found.

The fact is that when the AFL-CIO gave the Teamsters the old heave-ho the American labor movement exhibited a moral and intellectual maturity that signalized its coming-of-age. It is no longer in socage, villein or free; and the lords regnant of this world are never too pleased at having to make room for an addition to their company.

This is enough to account for the languor of the applause with which the deed was received. Bishops and Bankers and Able Editors are uneasily aware that henceforth whenever they adopt a top-lofty tone in addressing Messrs. Meany and Reuther, some voice at the back of the hall will inquire, "And when did *you* ever sacrifice a million a year rather than be associated with crooks?"

As far as the individuals involved are concerned this is perhaps a matter of no importance, but it is important from the standpoint of the rest of us. The fact is that in this action organized labor has given an exhibition of honesty and courage that goes far to allay the apprehension excited by the sheer dimensions of the AFL-CIO—an apprehension that is shared by many true friends of labor.

Expulsion of the Teamsters demonstrated that the present leadership of this giant organization is imbued with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind," and has the nerve and the energy to maintain that respect. Such men are fit to be intrusted with power, for in their hands power does not threaten, it safeguards the state.

That is the record. It is written, and it cannot be erased. But it can be deprived of much of its potential effect by coolness on the part of those who should praise it warmly. Expulsion of the Teamsters was extremely costly to the AFL-CIO, and can be justified only by the credit that should accrue to honorable and responsible leadership. If no credit accrues, then the effort was wasted.

Labor can ill afford wasteful leadership. If the courage and honesty of the men who ejected the Teamsters result in nothing but loss of income, then the logical course for the AFL-CIO will be to throw out Meany and Reuther, replacing them with leaders willing to strike hands with Judas Iscariot as long as he pays his dues.

The enemies of labor, of course, hope for just that. Committed to the proposition that any labor leader because he is a labor leader is presumably a scoundrel, they are left in an awkward position when the facts give them the lie. They are confident of their ability to deal successfully with scoundrels, but to be compelled to face able and honorable men would be a disaster.

THAT sentiment is shared by all self-seeking parasites who may have wormed their way into comfortable berths down the line of labor organization. The Teamsters seem by long odds the worst, but they are not the only union suffering from an infestation of such vermin. If the effort to delouse the Teamsters gains little or no public applause, the present terror of all the others will quickly subside, and with it the hope of strong, honorable and responsible leadership not at the top only, but throughout organized labor.

The lukewarm reception of the extraordinary effort in the case of the Teamsters is therefore at least as important to the public as it is to the individuals. Meany and Reuther are not our responsibility; let them look after themselves. But the encouragement by strong approbation of integrity and decency in any phase of public life is our responsibility, very much so. In this instance the media of general information have not discharged that responsibility with what a superficial observer is inclined to call conspicuous success.

GERALD W. JOHNSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For Civilian Leadership in the Space Age

Shortly after Sputnik I, Chairman Clinton Anderson of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy asked scientists at the Los Alamos Laboratory in his state of New Mexico what, in their opinion, is wrong with the US missile and space research program. "If you were the responsible agency in Washington," Senator Anderson inquired, "and if you were given the task, how would you go about setting it up?"

The proposal presented here is the response of 12 distinguished physicists and chemists appointed by the Los Alamos Chapter of the Federation of American Scientists headed by David L. Hill, Los Alamos group leader in theoretical nuclear physics and a pioneer in atomic fission.

RECENT startling developments have pointed out for all the world to see that we have fallen dangerously behind the USSR in the development and exploitation of science in the national interest. This hard fact is not surprising to anyone who has followed recent trends in the support and encouragement of Soviet science, including education, as opposed to our reluctance to place the proper emphasis on intellectual endeavors. Indeed the past few years have seen the emergence of an anti-intellectual climate and an atmosphere of smug self-satisfaction which places a premium on conformity and finds us woefully unprepared to meet the current challenge.

The root of the difficulties in which we find ourselves is in the system which places the military in such close control of scientific research and development.

After a long history of resisting and attempting to discard such developments as the steamboat, submarine, smokeless powder, radio, airplane, atomic submarine, atomic bomb, and so forth, the military, in the short space of 10-odd years, has become scientifically inclined to the extent of investing large amounts of time and money in research. To be sure, in the absence of other support this was better than nothing; however, there is considerable doubt in the scientific community as to the ability of the military to conduct scientific research in such a manner as to produce optimal results for a given expenditure of time, talent and money. The military has a long history of tradition for the sake of tradition, inter-service rivalry and bickering, and a discouraging lack of imagination in scientific matters.

In view of all this, together with the success of the civilian Atomic Energy Commission, there seems to be little wisdom in permitting the military to continue to exercise direct control over such a large fraction of the talent and money devoted to research today. This is especially true in the case of research pertaining to space travel, satellites, and ultraterrestrial research in general. It is obvious that for maximum scientific productivity this research should be done in a climate unfettered by narrow traditions, not unduly restricted by precedent and free from the "orders" of a ranking officer.

We suggest one way in which these ends can be achieved. This is by the formation of a civilian Space Commission modeled after the Atomic Energy Commission, which has long since proved the wisdom shown in its formation.

In forming this Space Commission a few mistakes made in setting up the AEC could be rectified.

The Commission should comprise five to seven members, and at least three to four of these should be scientists, the chairmanship being held by a scientist well experienced in scientific administration. Also included should be one representative each from industry and the military. As in the AEC, this Commission would report to the President and be empowered to request and receive appropriations from Congress. It would have the authority to decide what avenues of research (applied

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or basic) would yield the most profitable results for a given expenditure of time, talent and money.

The establishment and staffing of the laboratories devoted to ultraterrestrial research would be one of its prime responsibilities. The Commission is to have the authority and stature commensurate with its responsibilities. It should have all necessary authority to decide an issue on its scientific merits without regard to irrelevant political considerations of interservice rivalry.

It is believed that with such a Commission the talent that is now widely dispersed would gravitate into work sponsored by this Commission resulting in the assemblage of our most able scientists in a well-coordinated organization. Such an organization is essential if we mean to regain the ground lost under the present system.

While the establishment of a Space Commission will do much toward giving order to a very disordered system, it is felt that much more can be done toward giving science and technology its proper place in the national picture.

The most important single step would be the creation of a Department of Science and Technology with full Cabinet status. It seems clear that the contributions of science and technology to the commerce, health and living standard of our Nation make such a move mandatory. We know of no other field of human endeavor that has given anywhere near that of science to the peoples of the United States and the world in general. There is no doubt that almost all of our commerce today was created by science or at least depends heavily on it. (An excellent case in point is the television industry which has been created by science and technology in the space of 15-odd years, and is over a $5 billion industry.) Yet, we do not have a Department of Science and Technology while the need for a Department of Commerce seems clear to everyone.

The Value of Ultraterrestrial Travel

America is faced with the elementary need for those tools which will insure our survival in the face of Russian advances in science and technology. The need is much broader than the word "missile" would imply although it has been strikingly demonstrated in these past few months for all the world to see by the Russian successes with earth satellites.

Missiles, experimental satellites, and space platforms are but the steppingstones toward space operations and space travel. The idea of space travel has fired the enthusiasm of men. We propose that the United States combine the best of nationalism and of internationalism in its approach. Let us be nationalistic to the extent that we move ahead vigorously with our own resources without permitting the red tape of international agreements to delay our research and development. On the other hand, let us be international by having our laboratories open to the scientists of many lands and perhaps of all lands. Let them be welcome to come and join with us in our effort. Initially, they may come as guests, but soon such a program might lead to joint support from the governments of many nations. Thus we may succeed in diverting the military threat of competitive nationalistic conquest of space. By turning men's minds away from missiles as a new arm of war, and directing their attention instead on the conquest of the new frontier, great resources of enthusiasm and goodwill may be mobilized around the world and redound to the benefit of the United States.

It is implicit in this suggestion that the work will be unclassified because we believe such an approach will be relatively more advantageous to the United States. This view is supported by the current failures of the classified approach in the missile field.

We are unable now to evaluate in any quantitative way the worth to mankind of traveling to the moon, to the nearby planets or into outer space. However, the restless and inquiring spirit of man has throughout the ages pressed on wherever there were frontiers. The rewards of this search for knowledge are manifest. They include the very clothes we wear and the books we read. Our civilization is the composite of these outpourings of the inquiring spirit. Let the attention and energy of men be diverted away from this troubled planet of armed camps in which we live, and diverted toward the conquest of outer space instead of toward the conquest of each other.

In the present age of advanced technology, the defense of a country depends increasingly upon the wealth of scientific principles available for creation of military devices. By training and by delegated responsibility, however, the military people themselves cannot be expected properly to encourage and to support fundamental scientific research. Military decisions must always be taken in terms of present defense and military strength of the immediate future. Long-range commitments to scientific research having no foreseeable application will always tend to be abused and sidetracked by a military directorate. Thus the necessarily restrictive military interest itself demands that an agency equivalent in authority, prestige and budgetary priority to the Department of Defense, itself, should be created to assure the optimum growth of our national science program. Its task should be to provide funds where needed, and to assure that the freedom of individual enterprise and incentive as required for creative work in science should always be present.

The injury to our missiles program arising from interservice rivalries and disputes has been sufficiently well publicized that it need require no comment here. Although the present missiles program should probably move toward the achievement of the immediate objectives under approximately the present organization, it is clear that the next generation of missiles should be mothered by an authority operating separately from, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

independent of, the Department of Defense and its fighting subdivisions.

The research and development for our missiles program is presently under a diffuse structure which we shall call the industrial producer's type of organization. We believe this type of organization to be faulty and we propose instead a project-center type of organization for research and development. The industrial producer type of over-all organization has a number of defects, including the following:

1. Research in fundamental science is not germane to the short-term profit interests of an industrial corporation. Hence with rare exceptions industrial producers do not have an adequate assembly of scientists.

2. When the aircraft companies were given the responsibility for research and development on missiles, they attempted to remedy their scientific staff deficiencies by going into the personnel market with disruptive salary offers to buy the necessary personnel to provide adequate contract proposals and then to fulfill their contract commitments. These hiring practices of the aircraft companies served to uproot many hundreds of scientists from places in which they were effectively contributing to the national defense.

3. The newly-employed scientists were, with rare exceptions, utilized ineffectively and in many cases are still not being utilized effectively in the aircraft companies. In many cases, singly or in small groups, scientists are assigned problems to work on which can be effectively treated only by a substantial number of men working together. Thus there are not enough men together to make an effective or critical group.

4. Communication barriers between the companies prevent scientists in different parts of the country, who are assigned to work on closely related problems, from learning of the activities of their fellows. The natural difficulties of communicating between geographically separated companies are worsened by the proprietary interests of different industrial producers, which prevent them from making available to other industrial producers the information which one company may have uncovered.

5. Coordination of work by subcontractors has been, in the main, faulty. Thus missiles are assembled of components, each of which may be satisfactorily meeting its specifications, but the over-all assembly suffers because systems analysis for the unit as a whole has been inadequate.

6. Because each small team of scientists knows that there are probably several other teams trying to do the same thing, the sense of urgency on a given team, as far as the national program is concerned, is diminished.

7. A research and development program which must be closely coordinated to receiving and holding a contract for a specific job is defective for at least two reasons:

(a) The rush in each company to try to get a slice of government money available in a given area of missile development leads to chaotic research conditions, with poorly conceived plans patched together to try to submit a proposal as soon as required for bidding.

(b) In the present organization setup, the research programs are in general closely tied to production and are subject to the same vagaries in support as are the production items. Thus, the continuity is lacking for the continuing long-term research necessary to make breakthroughs into new principles and methods; moreover, the knowledge in the scientific world that such impermanence of research operations is characteristic of the industrial producer inhibits the ability of the company to acquire the highest caliber of scientific personnel.

8. The proprietary interests of the various industrial producers now engaged in the missiles program are providing a chief bottleneck for progress in this field. The Ramo Wooldridge Corp., which has the responsibility of receiving information on activities throughout the missile field, is unable to transmit to one company information which it receives from another because of the restriction of proprietary interests.

The characteristics listed above indicate why the industrial producer's approach has bungled our missiles effort.

Reorganize the Missile Program

In contrast, the project-center type of organization was highly successful in the early years of the atomic energy project and also in the development and application of radar. Some of the advantages of the project-center type of approach are the following:

1. Responsibility for achieving the proposed program is uniquely delegated to the project. Thus the highest sense of urgency is generated which leads to (a) the fullest dedication of the individual staff members to the task at hand, and (b) attracts into the project organization concerned scientists who wish to be sure they may go where they can make the maximum contribution to the Nation.

2. Scientists are brought together in one laboratory or at least into laboratories which are in close communication so that a sufficient number of people are available to form a "critical" or reactive unit for solving each particular problem.

3. A diversity of backgrounds, approaches and disciplines may be assembled in one large interacting project so that a minimum of delay is involved in working out new fields that require the merger of several disciplines and technologies.

4. The established objective is understanding of scientific principles and achievement of successful application. These objectives lead to better research results than the objectives mentioned above of rushing together some sort of contract application or, in general, trying to direct operations in such a manner as to be profitable from the short-range point of view.

5. Continuity of support for a research program is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

usually available so that the top-grade scientists are willing to make the investment of the years of time sometimes necessary to achieve significant advance.

6. The production of devices need not be done by the project organization itself. Once the specifications have been drawn as the result of the fullest liaison between scientists and engineers, then the work of production itself may be done in existing shops which are mostly under the roofs of the industrial producers. Industry, moreover, is accustomed to handling business this way and likes to receive a well-defined set of specifications and simply do the job as defined.

7. The organization operating the project should be neither a profit-seeking corporation nor directly an agency of the government. The difficulties which the profit motive interposes in the conduct of long-range research and development have already been noted. The disadvantage of direct government operation is the excessive amount of red tape which is then involved. Optimum operation apparently comes from a private non-profit foundation or some other private agency which may operate the project on a cost basis for the government.

8. When deserving programs of research have been conceived, there should be a minimum of difficulty in obtaining financial support for the research. A general defect at present in our country is that inadequate sums are available for the fundamental basic research that alone can generate the knowledge on which subsequent power over nature must rest. We have grown accustomed to spending large sums of money for engineering development but have not as a Nation yet come to understand that basic research itself is the source of all subsequent applications.

Clearly, if our system of free enterprise deserves to win out in the industrial competition with the Communist bloc of peoples, then it should be able to win the competition by the intelligent mobilization of the individual initiative, enterprise and resources of the free world. To some extent, the present mode of operation of the missiles program is a blundering effort to do just this. However, it seems apparent that we cannot longer afford to operate in a manner handicapped by the present difficulty of industrial producers in carrying on adequate scientific research programs. For the industrial production itself, we may continue to rely with confidence on our large industrial producers.

We believe that much of the remedy for the dismaying state of our present missiles and space research program must come through legislation of imaginative and courageous conception. We believe that the fundamental defect in the present situation stems from our failure as a Nation to comprehend the challenge of the new area of technology now opening for the conquest of outer space. It is imperative that America be set on the right track in moving into this great new endeavor. The above comments represent an effort to outline the character of legislation which would (1) mobilize the great energies and talents of the free world toward outer space research, (2) have the early effect of strengthening our military posture, and (3) cast our efforts in such a form that it may tend to draw together the peoples of the world, and permit in the foreseeable future the full conversion of military postures into attitudes of cooperation of all peoples in the conquest of outer space.

How Many Worlds?

by FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

"It is better to live in a world united than in a world divided," said Winston Churchill in 1946, "but it is also better to live in a world divided than in a world destroyed." If we dare assume that mankind will refrain from self-destruction, then the question of which divisions among its members are likely to prove decisive for the future acquires a significance transcending all immediacies of the here and now.

Current wisdom in the West takes it for granted that the cleavage between the "Free World" of democracy and the "Slave World" of Marxist totalitarianism is all-important and will determine the global shape of things to come. Future wisdom may indicate that this image is a caricature of reality; that America and Russia as industrialized Super-Powers are becoming more and more alike in their community problems and in the daily lives of their peoples; and that the schism which will determine the pattern of tomorrow has little to do with the

---

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN *is Woodrow Wilson Professor of Government at Williams College. The most recent of his many books on world affairs is* Russia Since 1917 *(Knopf, 1957). McGraw-Hill will publish in the spring a Sixth Edition of his* International Politics.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duel between Washington and Moscow and everything to do with the relations between the wealthy machine societies of Northern Eurasia and North America, whether "capitalist" or "Communist," and still desperately impoverished agrarian societies of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Yet the argument about to be offered would be unrealistic if it did not take initial cognizance of the chance that the answer to "How Many Worlds?" may be "No World." Americans and Russians, as spell-bound as Pavlov's dog by the conditioned reflexes of power politics in a State System lacking government and therefore condemned to international anarchy, are openly engaged in a race for "absolute weapons" whereby each can annihilate the other. Last June, long before the advent of the ICBM and the Sputniks, the Government of the United States published a 579-page slick-paper, illustrated volume entitled *The Effects of Nuclear Weapons*. Incredible horrors and atrocities are here depicted coldly in scientific language as if atrocities and horrors were normal phases of normal life in our time—for example on p. 461:

> An interesting observation made among Japanese survivors was the relatively low incidence of serious mechanical injuries. For example, among 675 patients (in Hiroshima), there were no cases of fractures of the skull or back and only one fractured femur. This was attributed to the fact that persons who suffered severe concussion or fracture or were rendered helpless by leg injuries, as well as those who were pinned beneath the wreckage, were trapped by the flames. Such individuals, of course, did not survive.

The conclusion drawn, and fully supported by the Civil Defense Administration and by more recent, more imaginative, and immensely expensive proposals, is that Americans must re-enforce their houses, dig holes in the ground, plan to evacuate cities, build shelters, and use water-repellent clothing in decontamination operations, after listening to Conelrad at 640 or 1240 on radio dials. Lewis Mumford in the *Saturday Review* of March 2, 1946, correctly characterized the climate of opinion in the Atomic Age:

> We in America are living among madmen. . . . These madmen have a comet by the tail, but they think to prove their sanity by treating it as if it were a child's sky-rocket. They play with it; they experiment with it; they dream of swifter and bigger comets. Their teachers have handed them down no rules for controlling comets; so they take only the usual precautions of children permitted to set off fire-crackers. . . . Why do we let the madmen go on with their game without raising our voices? . . . There is a reason: we are madmen, too. We view the madness of our leaders as if it expressed a traditional wisdom and a common sense; we view them placidly, as a doped policeman might view with a bland, tolerant leer the robbery of a bank or the bare-handed killing of a child or the setting of an infernal machine in a railroad station. Our failure to act is the measure of our madness. . . .

The issue is brought up to date in an editorial comment, "The Dance of the Lunatics," in *The Berkshire Eagle* (Pittsfield, Mass.) of November 26, 1957, published and edited by Lawrence K. Miller:

> These are bleak days for counting global blessings, but perhaps there is at least one worth mentioning. If there are intelligent beings on Mars, we can feel confident that they are not contemplating an invasion. Their advance patrols must have long since reported to the Martian bosses that planet Earth is just an outsized lunatic asylum, to be avoided like a plague.
>
> Picture the situation on this side of the globe objectively, if you still can. America today is engaged in a great debate (if we may dignify near-panic with such a term) and the basic issue is simple. Can we snuff out civilization as efficiently as the Russians can? The administration says we can; its critics say we can't. But both sides agree that in either event a monumental military effort is now mandatory.
>
> A monumental effort to what end? Merely to maintain (or regain, as the case may be) our place in an armaments race that all concerned have long since agreed is a global suicide pact. An armaments race that, even at the very best, can only produce an uneasy balance of terror in which a madman's push-button can relegate civilization to the incinerator.

The alternative urged is the only one available: a resumption of negotiations to halt the arms race and end the new Cold War. The rarity of such advice in the American press, along with the formidable barriers (*e.g.*, John Foster Dulles) in the way of any return to diplomacy, suggests incineration rather than survival as a distinct possibility. Even in this event the fall-out may well fall short of fulfilling Nevil Shute's forecast of the end of all life on earth. Only North Americans, Russians, and West Europeans may achieve co-annihilation, in which case surviving Asians, Africans, and South Americans will inherit the planet. New civilizations may later arise, as Toynbee once anticipated, among the pygmies and the eskimos. But the odds still favor, for a time, some negotiated scheme of co-existence or, at worst, a continuation of non-violent antagonism between the worlds of Marxland and Freeland.

Under such circumstances the contestants are likely to discover to their astonishment, long before 1984, that the differences between them which each believes to be the source of their implacable enmity are swiftly approaching the vanishing-point. They will further perceive clearly what they now see dimly: that the only meaningful fault-line along which contemporary societies are sharply divided is the line between Richland and Poorland. In comparison with the miserable masses of the "have-not" nations, both Russia and America are

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opulent with the fruits of science and technology and unquestionably belong to the smaller world of the "haves."

The sizes of these two worlds were revealed by the United Nations study of per capita income in 1949. No survey of comparable scope has since been made. Current figures would be appreciably higher for the US, the USSR, and Western Europe, but much the same for Poorland. All evidence suggests that the gap has widened, not narrowed. In a world population (1949) estimated at 2.4 billion, some 300 million people enjoyed per capita annual incomes over $400: US ($1,453), Canada, New Zealand, Switzerland (all between $800 and $900), Sweden ($780), Britain ($773), France ($482). Another 500 million people, including those of the USSR, Germany, Italy, Argentina, Turkey, Mexico, and Brazil, received from $100 to $400 per year in national averages. (That averages can be misleading is shown by other calculations indicating that 40 million of Brazil's 60 million people have never been to school, seen a doctor, worn shoes, or slept in a bed.) Some 1.6 billion people, comprising two-thirds of mankind, received in 1949, and in all likelihood still receive today, less than $100 per year, with the teeming multitudes of India and Pakistan below $60 and of the Philippines, Burma, Thailand, Korea, China, and Indonesia well below $50.

If the two worlds of greatest import for posterity are those of the poor and the rich (in a strictly non-Marxist sense), then common characteristics within each of these worlds are more significant than differences. Is the USSR the antithesis of the US? In political creeds and practices, perhaps. In all else that matters in designs for living, not at all. Both are communities of Big Cities, Big Industry, Big Banking, Big Government, Big Bureaucracy. In both "ownership" and "management" of enterprises are more and more divorced. In both the conformist "organization man" is a common type. In both the pecuniary elite or "new class" consists of business executives, party politicians and the military "brass." Both polities are "Welfare States," whether labeled "People's Capitalism" or "People's Socialism." Both societies are concerned over depersonalization, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, graft or *blat*, "feather-bedding" and "moon-shining" among workers, hypertension and stomach ulcers among administrators, and "mass culture" and anomy among the white-collared. Even literatures are parallel, for writers deal with common problems of highly industrialized and urbanized communities. In Moscow and Manhattan, as in Minneapolis and Magnetogorsk, individualists battle bureaucrats and philistines. Dudintsev's *Not By Bread Alone* is the Soviet version of Ayn Rand's *The Fountainhead*.

In the face of this process of "cultural convergence," in the vocabulary of the anthropologists, the ideological, motivational, and institutional differences between "capitalism" and "socialism" become increasingly meaningless to more and more people. Travelers are impressed more by similarities than by contrasts. C. Wright Mills sees the US and the USSR as both "overdeveloped" and "superior" nations dedicated to "technological prowess" and the blind worship of "the Science Machine." Max Lerner comments in *America as a Civilization*:

> Both America and Russia are materialist. They have a common activism, a masculine strength of purpose, a drive toward results, a genius for organization, a belief in progress, an obsession with production indexes and with magnitudes of all sorts, a conviction that their way of life will yield increasing satisfactions to their people.

De Tocqueville's insight of 1839 is strangely vindicated:

> There are, at the present time, two great nations in the world which seem to tend toward the same end, although they started from different points: I allude to the Russians and the Americans.

Meanwhile two human beings out of every three still dwell in the world's slumlands where machines, factories, schools, hospitals, railways and even roads are few and far between. Here sanitation reduces death rates and leads to explosions of population pressing upon resources in classical Malthusian fashion. Here masses of men and women remain ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, cursed by illiteracy, disease and indigence and often ruthlessly exploited by the few possessed of wealth and power. But millions among them have experienced the "revolution of expectations." They have grasped the thought that their misery is no longer inevitable and immutable. They are aspiring gropingly toward industrialization as an escape from poverty. They are marching, often blindly, out of darkness toward the sunshine reflected from the West.

How do the masters of Richland respond to the challenge of Poorland? The Western "bourgeoisie," confronting the non-Western "proletariat," is split into rival camps of democrats and Marxists. It is already evident that each can gain advantage over the other in winning friends and influencing people only by appealing to the poor in their quest for plenty. Washington, bewitched by anti-Communism, offers alliances, massive military aid with political strings attached, modest economic and technical assistance, comprehensive ignorance of alien languages and cultures, much talk about the American standard of living (which all the poor know they can never attain), and more eloquence about democracy and liberty which means nothing to peoples who have never known either. Moscow, no longer as hypnotized as formerly by anti-capitalism, offers respect for neutrality, modest military supplies when requested and without formal conditions, general technical and eco-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomic help, expert and sympathetic familiarity with foreign tongues and ways, and much eloquence about "anti-imperialism," land reform, "social justice," "racial equality and the virtues of native nationalism.

Freeland, say the Muscovites, seeks to perpetuate colonial exploitation and to use the poor as pawns for war. Marxland, says the West, seeks infiltration, subversion, and the imposition of a monstrous tyranny far worse than the old colonialism. Both sets of accusations contain elements of objective fact and of fear-inspired fantasy. But in their appeals to *les miserables* the rich men of Moscow have advantages over the rich men of Washington which the United States cannot soon or easily overcome.

Soviet big business is so organized for the accumulation and investment of capital as to make possible an annual rate of economic growth roughly double that achieved in the US. In the decades to come, despite current American wealth and relative Russian poverty, Soviet surpluses for productive investment in Poorland will ultimately exceed American surpluses, assuming no major changes in the ways in which Americans use, or waste, their resources. Soviet society, moreover, is so ordered, as Americans are learning with dismay, that "eggheads" are honored and rewarded instead of being regarded as "queer." The pragmatic results of this difference in values are painfully apparent in aviation, rocketry and astronautics—which are more dramatic and attention-compelling than other fields of scientific endeavor in which American leadership is still unchallenged.

Finally, albeit no finalities are visible in these matters, Russians can claim with some justice, despite the crimes of Stalinism, that their devotion to racial and national equality is more sincere than comparable American professions. Muscovy's "colonial subject peoples," in Western parlance, include 30 million Moslems of Central Asia and a multitude of lesser ethnic groups. None of these is "free." Some have suffered cruel persecution. But all have acquired factories, schools and hospitals and enjoy living standards far above those of their racial and religious confreres who live south of the Soviet frontier.

The inhabitants of Poorland are overwhelmingly non-Western in culture and language; indifferent to the Cold War, "colored," not "white," in epidermal pigmentation; hungry for foreign capital and technical and economic aid; and eagerly receptive to the promise of Western science. So long as America remains frozen in the rigidities of an approach which is irrelevant to the needs of the present and the opportunities and dangers of the future, so long will Russia continue to make gains in competing for favor among the impoverished. China's choice was made in 1949. The choices thus far made in India, Indonesia, Islam, all of Africa and even Latin America (consistently neglected by Washington as a "sure thing") may not prove final.

Let none conclude from these considerations, important as I believe them to be, that Marxist Muscovy is inexorably fated to "win the war" for the minds of men. Americans have repeatedly demonstrated their capacity to respond constructively to challenge from abroad. I do not doubt their ability to do so now, despite post-Sputnik hysteria and ample evidence of mounting irrationality. No one can any longer "win" any war as wars could be won in earlier times, whether they are waged by violence or by the gentler use of goods and symbols to achieve "prestige" and influence preferences.

Problems of public policy in the near future will inevitably be dominated by calculations of advantage by Soviet and American powerholders in their rivalry to convert the uncommitted countries of Poorland to their cause. Problems of public policy in the farther future will, I suspect, be shaped by a slowly dawning realization that what matters most in the long run is the overall pattern of relations between Richland and Poorland. That pattern can be one of collaboration in the service of shared purposes. Or it can conceivably become, as we are reminded by recent brutalities in Kenya and Vietnam and by continued savagery in Algeria, a nightmare of horror in comparison to which the thermonuclear extermination of millions may appear almost merciful.

Hostile competition between the two camps of the Rich in their rivalry for influence among the Poor will in the end, I believe, prove futile and fruitless for all involved. Cooperation, rather than competition, will serve the best interests of Poorland and Richland alike, including both factions of Richland. One instance must suffice. In January, 1956, Jacob Javits proposed (with nobody listening) that America and Russia should abandon their rival wooing of Nasser's Egypt and negotiate an accord for joint construction of the Aswan Dam, on terms acceptable to Cairo and involving equal contributions of capital and "know-how" from both Super-Powers. Had any such venture been launched, the violence of November, 1956, would never have taken place.

The hope of the future, and quite possibly "the last best hope of earth," is the prospect that policy-makers in Washington and Moscow will at long last come to terms and agree on a common program of cooperative endeavor to promote the welfare of the world's slum-dwellers. From such a program all would stand to gain. In the absence of such a program all will continue to lose. Do the peoples of Richland, including Americans and Russians alike, wish to avoid nuclear co-annihilation and preclude the future terror of a possible racial war of all hungry colored men against all wealthy white men? If so, they are summoned to join hands in lifting the poor to tolerable living standards and a new level of dignity as equal partners in One World dedicated to the good life.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS & COMMENT

Mr. Acheson's Pessimism

by S. L. A. Marshall

It should be pleasant news that at long last Dean Acheson has opened up as the nation's ex-Secretary of State after playing the Democrat who looks at his Party and the Citizen who looks at Congress.

But it isn't. There's already a chill in the air. It's the American winter of discontent with things as they have been as with the forecasts for tomorrow. The mere resignation of a not indispensable Army general provokes a national shudder. The false report that the Russians have shot a man into outer space echoes across the land like the trump of doomsday. The Senator from Texas, in his own State-of-the-Union message, implies the warning that we must either win the race to the moon or lose control of our piece of earth.

Power and Diplomacy, by Dean Acheson (Harvard; $3).

While a distinguished Admiral laments that it is too late to re-establish our situation, the simplest seaman might respond that it is not too early to get hold of ourselves.

There is common agreement that a main national requirement is the feeling of a sense of urgency. No two experts, no two panels of Big Name citizens, putting their credit behind the opinions of the experts, are agreed on what we should feel urgent about first and most.

But we aren't short everywhere. There are sufficient targets in the line of fire, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the educational system, the engineers of Project Vanguard and everyone sitting on the Gaither Report. It remains in dispute whether our woe comes of being under-missiled or over-misled. Nobody who is anybody has said that the average American may no longer secure greater savings and save greater security. All else, but never, never this.

Into the turbulence, Dean Acheson has dropped another thin book, this time on what ails the United States and what must be done for salvation. It's hard to read, grim to reflect upon.

Too tightly written, its main ideas fight for elbow room. Every other sentence is an epigram. Every other paragraph might be expanded into a chapter.

Yet Acheson has a naturally deft writing talent, sparkling with humor, as his essays on subjects other than statecraft have proved. He owes it to himself some day to sit at a mill and let his words flow generously, even as his logic builds up irresistibly, when his mind is challenged by a theme of utmost consequence.

More forbidding still is the theme itself. By Acheson's estimate of where the United States stands now and the indicated wave of the future, the free non-Communist world has a chance to endure uprightly for at least one more generation only if American government, business and people in concert perform miracles of lifting themselves by their own bootstraps. Either we will become re-energized, and in us, a vastly expanded productiveness will become attended by a greater nobility, or the American dream in any form is forever dead.

ACHESON doesn't use these words: it is the distilled judgment from the sum of his propositions. American industry must double its capacity. American labor must become less selfish. American society must become re-dedicated to freedom's cause, whatever the dollar cost. American policy abroad must prepare to express itself with tenfold the generosity of the Marshall Plan. American military power must be enlarged and reshaped for sensible balance. Either these things will be done, or the Communists have it made, though the United States launches a thousand super-Sputniks and stakes a claim on the moon.

Well, damn this book for its compactness and for the pessimism of its author who says we must achieve Utopia to remain the US. The warning that we must be reborn to survive isn't what anyone wishes to hear. Let's be reasonable. There is even a question whether Acheson was entitled to speak. Others in the anvil chorus keyed their warnings to the shock-news of Russian success with earth satellites these past several months. Acheson wrote before ever Laika became an American household word. His book is formed of four lectures given at Tufts' Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in early October. Sputnik isn't mentioned. One can't trust a man who sees earlier that the hour is later. So out with his book!

FOR THOSE who may still remain interested, it suffices to say that its unique values can no more be adequately reflected in a review than can it be expected that one clear voice will make harmony of Babel. It is not a blast, a preachment or in any real sense a criticism. It is a precise, urbanely-worded diagnosis of what has gone wrong with United States foreign-military policy and with the American spirit to bring us to the present position, and a candid if overly-hopeful appraisal of what can and must be done to get us out of the deep woods. Acheson does not look at the foreground trees and mistake them for the forest.

Therein his summing-up differs from the Rockefeller Report, Senator Lyndon Johnson's formula for recovery and the President's opening message to the Congress.

These are not analyses of the fundamental, decisive problem and of the moral deficiencies which inhibit a long-term solution. They are expedient prescriptions of techniques and programs which should be brought forward now lest we slip further backward. What requires reconstitution of the motor block is not long-saved by reorganization of the fenders.

Have we had plain speech from the other oracles? Conspicuous in all of them is an excessive tenderness on one score. All skirt the question of how an accelerated armament program is to be reconciled with a steadily contracting base of trained military manpower. Either they have faith in some magic to be worked without hands, or they would brush off a painful subject, thus jeopardizing their

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

credit among those who still believe that guided muscles also count.

Not so Acheson. Almost alone, he is the unconventional man in his championing of the decisive importance of adequate conventional force. The United States has cut too low. Its NATO allies will not try to raise sufficient forces. Yet the alliance has more than enough manpower reserve to top Russia's trained human resources. Its failure to utilize this strength—and it derives from the chronic indisposition of democratic statesmen to demand hard service of the free citizen—is the epitome of Western weakness.

It is time somebody said it.

To deal gently with John Foster Dulles while arraigning count by count the policy which he helped make is no mean feat. Acheson so does and his reader understands why. Basically, he views weakness in the national policy as the consequence of not "bringing the practices of American life closer to its professions." He has sat in the same seat, known its awesome frustrations and the pain of reaping personal blame for failures not one's own.

THE IDEAS of two party colleagues, not mentioned by name, are treated less graciously than are the acts of Mr. Dulles. One is George Frost Kennan, who would unify and demilitarize Germany to get Russians out of Western Europe, though US forces left also. To Acheson, the mere suggestion is abhorrent. Of such change would come the final ruin of Western hope. The Russians would never in fact withdraw but only simulate it. The United States would never go back.

Acheson's other target is Senator John Kennedy who is taken apart for his "naïve" resolution supporting the Algerian nationalist cause against the interests of France. "Nothing could be more injudicious than this proposal except making it."

I shall not list all points wherein Acheson differs with the Eisenhower-Dulles view of what United States foreign policy should be. But the objections are all trenchantly put, clearly argued and considered in the light of the risks attending the alternatives. For example:

In throwing its weight against the French-British intervention at Suez, the United States failed miserably. "Our allies were taught that, not only would we make no sacrifice to help them in a matter of vital interest, but that we would join the opposition to them."

That we turned soft in the face of Russian intimidation at that time was not less costly. "The Soviet Union would have blustered, threatened, and made all the propaganda value it could out of a really strong and united stand by the Western allies." But it would not have moved.

OUR fault is that we seek in our alliances what is best for us rather than cultivating in ourselves what is best for our alliances. "If we act in ways which are helpful in accomplishing what we have to do and avoid doing what is harmful, it may be easier to find our way however hard it may be to follow it."

The policy of massive retaliation was never a credible threat since "not even those who made it meant it," as was proved in Indo-China and Hungary. Yet "in developing the composition of its military forces, this Government has been acting for some years as though it were going to rely upon the incredible threat."

Above all, US policy should be directed toward developing greater strength at the center, irrespective of attitudes in Asia and Africa. "In our case, these states are those of the Western Hemisphere and Europe."

But this critique of its policy is by no means loaded exclusively against the Administration. Acheson is as pessimistic as Dulles about the worthwhileness of negotiations with the Russians. "It is my conviction that the only agreements which are possible now would be disadvantageous to us and would not diminish the dangers of nuclear war."

There is much more of the same. Even so, Acheson's appreciation of the situation is much less likely to stir controversy because of its retrospective criticism of foreign policy than to demand attention because of its forward-looking estimate of the military programs and postures required for survival.

This is the meat of the book. His credentials are the wisdom that he brings to the discussion. Certain of the major propositions have already been stated—that the West's standing forces are too thin, that without NATO free world defense must ultimately collapse and that military alliances are either supported steadfastly or they wither.

He takes note that the Strategic Air Command, to be an effective deterrent, must have the capacity to survive a surprise attack against us, and demonstrably possess that degree of power and protection, which it now lacks. This is not new. Thomas K. Finletter said it better. There are other points which must be studied in context for the weight of the argument:

To contemplate the use of nuclear weapons elsewhere than in Europe is against the interests of the United States.

It would be wiser to leave nuclear weapons in American and British hands and not hasten their dissemination.

It would be disastrous to increase nuclear power in Europe as part of our present policy of increasing reliance on nuclear weapons.

The theory that limited nuclear war is possible in Europe fails because it is based upon assumptions which are not true and ignores the crucial importance of the air battle.

Half-trained reserves and rapidly rotating draftees do not suffice a modern weapons system.

If NATO nuclear power is built up within Europe, it should be done only as a stop-gap measure pending the raising of adequate conventional power.

WHEN assembled, this body of ideas is a manifesto of radicalism if only because its parts are so soberingly old-fashioned. Theories about the possibilities of limited nuclear war have become almost as popular as rock'n'roll. The national air also throbs with the warning that world fate depends above all else on the development of a superior missiles technology by the United States, and general use by our West European allies of the intermediate ballistic weapons when we at last produce an efficient one, rather than upon reinstating the principle of balanced, adequate fighting power and acting upon it.

Amid confusion, one need not agree on every score with the argument of a vigorous dissent to urge that if it is widely heard confusion will become less. The case is not fully organized. Many of Acheson's close friends will find it difficult to accept all he says in critizing foreign policy or asserting what military policy should be. In him there is an overweening tendency to be self-justifying and to defend his own actions as guiding an inviolate and (if unproved)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle. That may make him seem the more human to some who have regarded him as the incarnation of Beelzebub.

Left until last is the heart of his theme —that the rising threat of Communist power is not to be checked by the United States redressing the balance either in the contest to conquer outer space or in the count of decisive, fantastic weapons. The USSR is marching toward superiority in over-all productiveness while we move at a crawl. What the Russian system takes of its people insures that their rate of progress will continue. What our system fails to seek of its people, and what they of themselves will not voluntarily yield, makes it seem improbable that our unfavorable rate of advance will quicken enough and in time.

We have the potential; but recovery awaits the shining forth of some new inner light. All of this has been said before, frequently and eloquently. But the wait is not less and the signs of belt-tightening and a spiritually freshened awakening are not more.

The Bang and the Whimper

by Charles Curran

MR. T. S. ELIOT is the Jayne Mansfield of the intellectuals. Miss Mansfield comprises all the arguments that can be urged in support of the proposition that there is a whole sex consisting entirely of women; and, similarly, Mr. Eliot epitomizes one side of the great debate between left thinkers and right thinkers. For he is Reaction made flesh. He believes in original sin, in the fall of man, in the permanence of evil; he is for monarchy, and aristocracy, and rule by a cultivated elite. Whenever he hears the word "progress" he unscrews the cap of his fountain-pen.

The Sweeniad, by "Myra Buttle" (Sagamore; $2).

No other man born in St. Louis, or anywhere else in Missouri, has done more than Mr. Eliot to make Reaction intellectually respectable. Ever since he settled in England, more than 40 years ago, he has been the skeleton at the feast of reason. His plays, his poems, his polemical essays have won him admission to the most jealously-guarded citadel in Britain—the Order of Merit, which is limited to 24 persons, a Valhalla where Mr. Eliot takes his ease in the company of such immortals as Augustus John, Bertrand Russell and Sir Winston Churchill.

Dr. Victor Purcell views this state of affairs with alarm and despondency. Dr. Purcell is himself a British intellectual (he is Lecturer in Far Eastern Affairs at Cambridge University); but he is a man of the left, who believes in progress, and liberalism, and democracy as well. He thinks it is high time somebody revalued Mr. Eliot; and he has decided to do it by mockery. Consequently, he has written *The Sweeniad*, using the pen-name of Myra Buttle.

The Sweeniad is a savagely satirical parody, in 66 pages, of Mr. Eliot's poem *The Waste Land*. *The Waste Land* was London as Mr. Eliot saw it in the early 1920's, when optimists were proclaiming that war would never come again, and that humanity could now settle down to the task of putting two cars in every bathroom. In that false dawn, Mr. Eliot stood up like Job, scraping his potsherd on other people's skins. He mocked at the optimists. He called them Sweeney, whom he portrayed as a sort of latter-day Caliban, rising from the ashes of Western civilization in order to curse and talk nonsense and fornicate amid the debris. In order that persons who dislike poetry on principle should not miss the point, Mr. Eliot repeated it in prose, particularly in *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture* (published in 1948). It is this corpus of literary propaganda that Dr. Purcell seeks to disembowel.

Now the basic rule of controversy was laid down by Swift; if you want to capture public opinion, he said, you had better get the laughers on your side. In *The Sweeniad*, Dr. Purcell does his utmost to obey this precept.

He has studied Mr. Eliot with the baleful intensity of Miss Atlantic City's runner-up studying Miss Atlantic City. Every one of his target's mannerisms—and there are a lot of them—is picked out, mimicked, held up to ridicule with fidelity, gusto and hatred. *The Waste Land*, for instance, is plastered with displays of erudition that is usually irrelevant and sometimes meaningless—as though the author were sprawling, with spurious ease, amid the cultures of Greece, Rome, Egypt, Judaea, India and China; the footnotes to the poem look like a magpie's nest. Dr. Purcell guys this characteristic with cruel skill. He leaves no stone unflung. He re-writes the famous lines "This is the way the world ends, Not with a bang, but with a whimper" with a four-letter word for the climax.

When he is mocking Mr. Eliot, Dr. Purcell is very funny. He flings his darts with precision of a picador at a bull-fight; and every one is tipped with venom. Yet in the end the bull leaves the ring bloody but unbowed. For Dr. Purcell makes two mistakes, and the second one is fatal to him.

He does not play fair. To attack Mr. Eliot by calling him Sweeney is to substitute the character for the author. It is like trying to devalue Mr. Arthur Miller by calling him Willy Loman. This may not be thimble-rigging; it may be in reality confusion caused by anger. But a satirist should not become muddled—particularly when muddle-mindedness is one of his counts against his victim.

FAIR PLAY, however, has little to do with satire, any more than with a poker game played in a mining camp; either way, the dealer is entitled to his privileges. But Dr. Purcell's second mistake is far more serious. For he falls into a trap that generations of theatre critics have learned to avoid. To tell a performer that he is bad, and to mock him for his badness is often diverting and always safe. But when you offer to show him how to do better you are monkeying with the buzz-saw. Yet Dr. Purcell does exactly this.

The Sweeniad is in the form of a nightmare mock trial, where the case for and against Sweeney is argued before a tribunal. There is a postulator and a devil's advocate, as there is when the Roman Catholic Church decides whether or not to make someone a saint. Now the case for Sweeney is put with an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ironic mockery that is highly effective. But the devil's advocate, is intellectually *impar negotiis*. He seeks to refute Mr. Eliot's beliefs and to substitute for them his own creed of man's natural goodness and perfectibility. But he does this with words and arguments so trite, so shallow, so banal that they are unintentionally funny. The poem moves abruptly from satire to soapbox.

A generation has passed since *The Waste Land* was written; the world has lived through Hitler, Stalin, Belsen, Auschwitz, Karaganda and Vorkuta, as well as Hiroshima. It is surprising indeed, in 1958, to find anyone prepared to set down as pungent and devastating the naïve variations on the theme of Progress as a Good Thing that are contained in *The Sweeniad*. But there they are. Dr. Purcell begins with a bang, but he ends as a whimper.

D. H. Lawrence and His Friends

by Janet Winn

WE GO to a writer's correspondence hoping to at once enlarge our knowledge of the work and satisfy our curiosity about the man. In the case of the new *Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence* our hopes, in both respects, are almost completely frustrated. About Lawrence's work, the letters reveal little. He writes that one of his books is being suppressed and that another is going to have a hard time finding a publisher; he complains about critics; he announces that he is working on a novel and that it is the best thing he ever wrote; he wonders if the typist of the *Lady Chatterly* manuscript can be trusted to leave in the four letter words. . . . As for "ideas," though the correspondence abounds with them, they are hardly of a nature to surprise even the most assiduously careless of Lawrence's readers. His "sexual ideas," as the editor calls them, certainly require no further amplification. "The word penis or testicle or vagina doesn't shock me," he writes to Willard Johnson; and for some reason we aren't shocked either.

Selected Letters of D. H. Lawrence, edited with an introduction by Diana Trilling (Great Letters Series: Farrar, Straus & Cudahy; $4.50).

On the subject of other authors, Lawrence *is* perhaps a bit startling. "I got *Sportsman's Sketches*," he writes to Catherine Carswell, "and have read them. No I don't like Turgenev very much. . . . I read *Deerslayer* just before the Turgenev. And I can tell you what a comedown it was, from the pure and the exquisite art of Fenimore Cooper—whom we count nobody—to the journalistic bludgeonings of Turgenev." He didn't like E. M. Forster very much either; but there, one can see, for good enough reasons: "I had such a silly, funny little letter from E. M. Forster telling me *a propos* of nothing that he admires me but doesn't read me."

The most interesting—and baffling—aspect of the correspondence is the personal one. We need scarcely be reminded here (as Leon Edel reminds us in his introduction to *The Selected Letters of Henry James*), that "the voice we hear is speaking in another room—and not to us." Many of the letters are so personal, that they are impenetrable (Example: "Your letter with Murry's enclosed this morning. They make me sick to the pit of my stomach. The cold insect-like ugliness of it. I shall avoid meeting - - - - - -.") But even when we think we know what it is that Lawrence is being sick to his stomach about, we still don't quite know what to make of Lawrence. He was supposed to have been amiable, and to perfect strangers or new acquaintances, it appears that he was very amiable indeed. "I think we might get on well together," he writes to a young man who had sent him some bad poems. "I'm quite nice really, though nobody would tell you so." Or in a subsequent letter: "What a rum chap you are! Are you a celibate?"

But for his close friends, Lawrence had little amiability and as time went by—one could almost say—use. "Let us clear away all nonsense," he wrote J. Middleton Murry in 1924, "I don't *need* you. That is not true. I need nobody." A year later he asked Murry to remember "you have betrayed everything and everybody up to now." (He adds though, that "Judas was a Jew, and you're not quite that, yet.") We remember that Lawrence had once felt rather differently about Murry. "He is one of the men of the future—you will see," he told Lady Ottaline Morel early in 1915, "he is with me for the Revolution. . . . At present he is my partner—the only man who quite simply is with me—one day he'll be ahead of me." But by the end of the year, he was already beginning to complain (to Katherine Mansfield) that "Murry irritates me and falsifies me and I must tell him so. He makes *me* false."

Murry wasn't the only friend who irritated Lawrence and got told so. Bertrand Russell was informed that:

> I would rather have the German soldiers with rapine and cruelty, than you with your words of goodness. . . . The enemy of all mankind, you are, full of the lust of enmity. It is *not* the hatred of falsehood which inspires you. It is the hatred of people, of flesh and blood. It is a perverted mental bloodlust. Why don't you own it.
>
> Let us become strangers again, I think it is better.

Dorothy Brett caught hell for the "halfness" of her friendship:

> "You friendship for - - - - was spiritual — you dragged sex in and he hated you. He'd have hated you anyhow. The halfness of your friendship I also hate, and between you and me there is no sensual correspondence.

There are many other examples of Lawrence's extreme dismay with his friends, when they got out of line and proved incapable of looking at life exactly as he looked at it. But at no time are we persuaded that they should have done so. If the letters reveal anything, it is that Lawrence was not a very good correspondent. To call his letters "the best in modern English literature," as Diana Trilling does, "and second only to Keats' in the whole history of English literature," is to misunderstand the meaning of the word "best"; to confuse chaos with order, crudity with grace, irrascibility with sense and pettiness with profundity.

Mrs. Trilling's introduction is of no discernable value, except possibly to Norman Podhoretz, who gets some free (and dubious) publicity out of it; the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essay is in the form of a letter to Mr. Podhoretz. Instead of doing the job, admittedly thankless, of providing the reader with relevant information in an orderly fashion and as quietly as possible, Mrs. Trilling prefers to deal in random irrelevancies and to draw as much attention to herself as possible. The first four pages (the letter is 26 pages long) are a very frank and very tiresome discussion of the editor's difficulties in getting her introduction done: "you knew immediately what was standing in my way," she relates (Mr. Podhoretz had met her the other day and asked if the introduction was finished and she said no and Mr. Podhoretz gave her a "generational leer"), "I was afraid to write about Lawrence because he used to be so important to me, as to most of my friends . . . now I didn't think so and was afraid to confront the reasons.

"Well for the moment I offered no dissent because—it's probably a mistake for me to confess this to you—it had seemed to me, too, that my inability to get the job done was 'resistance', a refusal of self-knowledge. . . ." and so on, and on and on. . . .

The remaining 18 pages are equally illuminating. There is, for instance, "the matter of Frieda Lawrence." Mrs. Trilling doesn't think much of Frieda. "I *really* know nothing about her," she admits, "I've never even known anyone who met her." But why should that matter? After all, "this, dear Norman, is literary criticism. . . ." Here are some examples of literary criticism:

"I think Frieda was a bit of a swamp . . .

"She had a swampy mind . . . " (though a few pages later Mrs. Trilling thinks better of it, and decides that Mrs. Lawrence had no mind at all. "If Frieda had had a mind, she would of course have lost it . . . ")

"She must have been an awful nuisance . . .

"She aged badly . . .

"She had no real intellect . . .

"She was worried about being pregnant . . .

"(she) was the kind of person who instinctively misses a train . . ."

The letters are arranged in chronological order and the majority of them were taken from Aldous Huxley's edition of Lawrence's letters which came out in 1932, a few years after Lawrence's death.

THEATRE

The Return of Maxwell Bodenheim

ALTHOUGH *Winkelberg* sounds like the locale of a Lehar operetta, complete with a *kronprinz,* a saucy barmaid, mistaken identity, melody and *schmaltz,* it is actually a thinly veiled life of the late Maxwell Bodenheim, teeming with people, turbulence and talk; but—in its fairly stark way—every bit as schmaltzy.

Ben Hecht, who grew up with Bodenheim in Chicago and who has brooded about disinterring him for the past three years, has written a sprawling, talky, episodic play extolling the megalomania of a very tiresome poet. While I hate to question any author's choice of subject matter, it does seem that Mr. Hecht finds Bodenheim fascinating beyond all bounds of reason.

Winkelberg, by Ben Hecht (Renata Theatre).

In sorry truth Bodenheim was a boozy old boor — and, worse, a bore — who flourished briefly and loudly during that odd period of Bohemia when the ability to shock was often mistaken for the ability to write. He is remembered, if at all, for a novel entitled *Replenishing Jessica,* which achieved a certain popularity when it was banned. Other than that, he was an unread and unreadable poet and novelist, a bombastic old lush who panhandled in the more picturesque reaches of Greenwich Village, cadging drinks, delivering drunken diatribes, insulting those who were minding their own business and being thoroughly obnoxious until his sordid murder took him from our midst. It is unlikely that anyone under 40 ever heard of him; that many over that age recall him; or that those who knew him care very much whether he's dead or alive. He was the sort of person you want to forget.

Because Mr. Hecht sticks pretty close to the facts, *Winkelberg* can hardly be expected to be a very good play, but it is a tribute to the considerable talents of Mr. Hecht, the cast and the director that it is an interesting play and—much of the time—a spellbinding one.

The action begins with Jonathan Winkelberg (the name assigned to Bodenheim) shot dead and lingering in Limbo while his *chi-chi* ex-chums discuss him over a fashionable luncheon table. From then on, with the corpse as narrator, we follow the career of Winkelberg versus The Enemy. It begins with Winkelberg as a starry-eyed poet of seventeen brutalized and robbed by The Enemy, a Chicago nightclub owner. Next he is railroaded into jail by The Enemy, a shanty Irish lawyer. Following this he is tossed out into the snow by The Enemy, a rapacious Chicago landlord, because he is too proud (too idealistic, really) to marry Louise, a rich dabbler in art.

In New York Winkelberg's poetry is crucified by The Enemy, a brittle pansy literary critic. Too proud to truckle to the adversary, Winkelberg is reduced to a flop house where, again, The Enemy (this time called Sailor Mike) flaunts his sadistic evilness. Rescued from the gutter by the reappearance of good old Louise, he is given a chance to redeem himself as a writer. But a drunken outing ruins all that. Then, befriended by a pathetic little prostitute, Winkelberg has a disillusioning and disastrous interlude with the Communist Party. Once again The Enemy, still as Sailor Mike, turns up and murders Winkelberg, who — after two and a half hours of laying everyone and everything to filth—winds up chewing out God Himself until a "special place" is found for him in the hereafter.

As I have already said, *Winkelberg* is a play of some power, but at no time could I cease to wonder at the inner workings of its unintegrated, uncouth, untalented hero as he railed at everything around him in reasonless, ridiculous rebellion. Had he only been *for* something (except Winkelberg) there might have been more reason to listen to

Notes on Contributors

S. L. A. MARSHALL is an eminent military critic, the author of a number of books, and an editorial writer for the *Detroit News.* CHARLES CURRAN is a regular contributor to the London *Spectator.* JANET WINN has previously written about movies for *NR.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him. As it is, he fires hundreds of iconoclastic epigrams into the audience. Some are funny; more are not and most of them are so outrageously old fashioned that I felt a certain admiration for Mr. Hecht's ability to catch the true leadenness of Bodenheim's repartee.

Everything else is quite wonderful, Mike Kellin, in the title role, lends dignity, wit and warmth to a character who is essentially unsympathetic. In the five-part stint as The Enemy, James Mitchell is as convincing as he is versatile as an epicene critic, a prohibition hood, a slimy lawyer, a venal landlord and the bestial Sailor Mike. Not until the very end did I realize that one man had played all these thankless roles. Frances Chaney, who has either inherited or acquired a flawless Chicago accent, is first rate as Louise the lovelorn dilletante. And Sondra Lee, a tiny grotesque of an actress, is fiery, heartbreaking and completely winning as the poor little streetwalker. The other sixteen actors who play the fifty roles required in *Winkelberg* are equally praiseworthy.

Lester Polakov's scenery and lighting are as impressive—mostly—as they are inexpensive, which says a lot. And Lee Falk's direction is nothing short of genius.

So much brilliance, time and trouble have been poured into *Winkelberg* that it is tragic not to be able to say that this is a good play. It is not, and that is because the *nothingness* that was Maxwell Bodenheim eats its way like a maggot through the thin shroud of spurious virtue with which these many gifted people have draped the festering remains of a bitter, neurotic No-Talent.

PATRICK DENNIS

EUROPE

Summer 1958—70 days

We'll see the usual, plus North Africa, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Berlin, Denmark, and Ireland. A low priced, different kind of trip for the young in spirit who don't want to be herded around.

EUROPE SUMMER TOURS
255 Sequoia (Box N)
Pasadena, Calif.

Correspondence

(Continued from page 3)

truth. Standards in many such colleges aren't what they could and should be. This is the constructive side of the article.

The destructive side which will far outweigh the other, may be summarized under these points: (1) it will help add fuel to the flames which threaten to set afire public education generally, and this at a time when hysteria toward the schools is rapidly being built up; (2) it will widen the gulf between teachers of Education and those of the humanities in our colleges when they should be making an increased effort to work together; (3) Above all, it will aid those potent voices in the nation who believe that since *all* is wrong in the state teachers colleges, the best solution is simply to "fold them up" or turn them into science institutes for the purpose of making bigger and better wars.

WILLIAM H. FISHER
Las Vegas, New Mexico

"the reasons for our shortcomings"

THE education business is well endowed with self-critics, but criticism is commonly focused on another part of the field than our own little quarter-section. The "What Johnny Don't Know" epidemic of recent months in *NR* consigns the guilt to the high schools. This seems to be a link in a chain from the teachers of toddlers to the teachers of Ph.D. candidates. I observe a tendency for each succeeding teacher in the grades to complain of the product received in September. We in the high schools deplore having to teach, say Civil War history, to some students who don't know North from South. The colleges confront us with "what Johnny don't know," and those in graduate school complain that they receive candidates having no more background than outstanding high school graduates should have. And, at times, an older generation of Ph.D.'s bemoans the crass ignorance of their younger brethren.

At a time when we are so burdened with outside critics, when conservative tax interests are pointing out that education is not really a very good bargain after all, when a confused administration is not sure whether to blame Harry Truman or John Dewey for Sputnik, when competition for the tax dollar is becoming more intense with each year's budget—this is a time for pointing out the reasons for our shortcomings instead of repetitiously advertising them. If we engage in finger-pointing we should point to a need for smaller classes, more clerical help, more counselling, new departures in education that allow for our larger and more heterogeneous numbers, and public indulgence of the fact that 100 percent of the population cannot be educated in the traditional way.

MARK HANNAFORD
Social Studies Dept.
Lakewood High School
Long Beach, California

"not as hopeless"

THE SHORTCOMINGS of our public schools are often attributed to the influence of Deweyan theory or to the stranglehold of us educationists, typified by Teachers College of Columbia University. There is nothing Deweyan, however, about the conditions Mr. Stevenson describes, nor would any reputable educationist be interested in defending them. Indeed, all serious educators, educationists included, are bending their efforts to change just such conditions.

Mr. Stevenson's report seems to document the point that the major weaknesses in our educational system are much less a result of the prevalence of a given philosophy or of the influence of the powerful university schools and departments of education, than they are a reflection of weaknesses which pervade our whole society, our lack of respect for learning, our propensity for playing politics and "playing it cool," our condoning of dishonesty in relationships not involving personal property, and so on. If this view of the sources of the ills of education is correct, the situation if not as hopeless as it appears to Mr. Stevenson, still presents us with a task at least as complicated and difficult as almost any one can imagine.

EDWARD T. LADD
Yale University

"a few million reprints"

HOW about a few million reprints of David Stevenson's article "Who Will Teach the Teachers." The picture he paints of Murray State College and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eastern Illinois University is distressingly accurate and could well be applied to a great many others. Some 28 years ago I became a member of the faculty of the Northern Illinois State Teachers' College which now calls itself Northern Illinois University. I came from the University of Michigan, in the spirit of a missionary seeking to raise the intellectual tone of a teachers' college. But the plain fact is that the teachers' colleges do not want to be saved. The professional Educationists and the professional administrators have a strangle hold on them which cannot be broken.

As at Eastern we have a beautiful paper organization of committees and a Senate, but they exist only to ratify decisions and policies already made in the front office, and not one of them dares to depart from the party line.

Students preparing to teach in the elementary schools get about forty semester hours of so called professional courses, but they graduate with only nine hours in the Humanities which comprehend the inconsequential fields of Art, Foreign Language, History, Literature, Philosophy and Music. Perhaps they are well adjusted, but they are cultural morons.

Perhaps the situation is hopeless as Professor Stevenson concludes, but if anything is to be done about it, now is the time, and articles such as his should be given the widest publicity. Our administrators do not read *The New Republic*, but, if we had reprints of this article, we could at least give them an opportunity to do so. By the way, we have a new Field House.

HUGH JAMESON, *Chairman*
Dept. of Social Studies
Northern Illinois Univ.
De Kalb, Ill.

"the last three words"

THE ONLY THING I like about David Stevenson's article is the last three words. I have been a teacher for over fifty years, 35 of which I spent as chairman of Music Education at Oberlin College, and from there I sent out hundreds of fine teachers, many of whom not only loved their work but became distinguished educators. My students did not merely study methods of teaching music, they also took courses in such fields as English Composition and Literature, History, even Science and Mathematics, so that when they graduated they were not only excellent musicians and practical teachers of music, but they also knew quite a bit about the rest of life on this earth—even a bit of Philosophy and Psychology.

Perhaps the thing that is wrong with education in the US is that we have too many bitter or sour teachers such as David Stevenson seems to be; and when you have a sour teacher you inevitably have sour students.

KARL GEHRKENS
Elk Rapids, Mich.

► *Colleges and American Life*

SIRS:

SAWIN and NORMAN's challenging articles ("What Johnny Don't Know," August 12, and "What Johnny Needs to Know", December 23) point the way to a raising of our colleges' standards but suggest some further important questions.

Many of us, I think, have got into our heads some notions that might prove obstacles to a tightening of college standards. Chief among these is a paradoxical idea that colleges are essential to American life but that their most serious purpose is social. A man who feels this way senses that they are responsible for much of our vaunted social mobility, and he credits to them the fact that in his eyes we are a land of but two social classes: the college-bred and the non-collegiate. He reasons further that for the merest slip of a bursar's receipt his child can either keep the family in the upper class or lift it there.

It is surely less serious that colleges harbor some mentally deficient students than that we have distilled a non-intellectual atmosphere onto our campuses and around our schoolhouses, and both youngsters without brains and a good many with brains have been enveloped by it. To raise academic standards would not suffice to dispel that atmosphere. As long as college spells status, those who want a diploma without an education will cram or crib their way to it. Somehow we must do the very difficult and far-reaching thing of making intellectual achievement signify the pinnacle of status. We must go in the direction of superimposing on our image of a nearly classless America an aristocracy of learning.

RABBI DANIEL E. KERMAN
Congregation Beth Sholom
Kilgore, Texas

MEMO TO WRITERS:
The priceless ingredient in every book is the integrity of the publisher. If we are convinced of the quality and sales potential of your manuscript, we will offer you a fair cooperative contract. Publication will be handled by men of vision and experience.
Submit your manuscript to:
THE AMERICAN PRESS
Attn: Mr. Ullmont, 489 Fifth Ave., N.Y.C.

$1600 CASH Awards plus 40% Royalty
All types of manuscripts invited.
Best Book Contest For 1958
For Contest rules and details of famous publishing plan, write for Brochure N.
Pageant Press, 101 Fifth Ave., N. Y. 8

AN ANNOUNCEMENT
Be a co-owner (shareholder) of
MANUFACTURERS TRUST CO, NYC
(price about $43 a share, earned 9.4% on share cost last year). The "smart" investor, the wealthy, and financial institutions all favor and own bank stocks for generations. 5 shares and up available. No service or commissions charged. Also special services to financial institutions.
MAXWELL MAY CO. *Bank Stock Specialists*
17 East 55th St., New York 22, N. Y.
Phone Plaza 1-1663
Much More Profit with Absolute Security

MAKE MONEY WRITING
. . short paragraphs!
You don't have to be a trained author to make money writing. Hundreds now making money every day on short paragraphs. I tell you what to write, where and how to sell; and supply big list of editors who buy from beginners. Lots of small checks in a hurry bring cash that adds up quickly. No tedious study. Write to sell, right away. Send for free facts. **BENSON BARRETT, Dept. 137-J, 7464 N. Clark St., Chicago 26, Ill.**

HISTORY TEACHER, bachelor, 25. Craves summer employment involving world travel, M.S. 3131 Bagley, Apt. 1, Los Angeles 34, California.

$70 WEEKLY — home, spare time. Simplified mail bookkeeping. Immediate income — easy! Auditax, 34757 DA, Los Angeles 34.

BRITISH BOOK BARGAINS—ALL SUBJECTS. Catalogues free. Transbooks, Box 1—NR, Wantagh, New York.

BRITISH SHOES FOR GENTLEMEN at a fraction of their American retail price! $10.95 includes duty and import charges. Delivery in ten days from receipt of order. Unconditional money-back guarantee. Write for free illustrated catalogue. Steven Williams, Jr., Ltd., 40 Chatham Road, Short Hills, New Jersey.

LEARN WHILE ASLEEP: Details free. Research Association, Box 610-NR, Omaha, Nebraska.

CLASSIFIED RATES
Per word (single insertion) 12c
Per word 6 times in one contract year 11c
Per word 13 times in one contract year 10c
Per word 26 times in one contract year 9c
Per word 52 times in one contract year 8c
NEW REPUBLIC
1244 Nineteenth St. N.W., Wash. 6, D.C.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FREE

an exclusive report On the explosive MIDDLE EAST!

featuring a hard hitting debate between official spokesmen for Israel and the Arabs . . .

. . . in a special issue of

The PROGRESSIVE

Articles and commentary by

CHESTER BOWLES
HUBERT HUMPHREY
NORMAN THOMAS
JAMES WARBURG

Now, within the covers of a single issue, The Progressive has brought together a comprehensive survey of the Middle East—the historical background, the facts about oil, the elements of the great power struggle between the Soviet and free world, and an appraisal of American foreign policy in this critical area.

And for the first time in an American magazine, The Progressive brings you a full dress debate between the Israeli and the Arabs.

You may have a copy of this special issue FREE with an introductory subscription to The Progressive at the rate of

7 months for only $2

Enclosed is $2. Send The Progressive for 7 months, plus a FREE copy of "The Middle East," to:

Name.....

Address.....

.....

The PROGRESSIVE 405 W. Gorham Madison, Wisconsin

No magazine in America surpasses The Progressive in its fifty year old reputation for printing facts often suppressed, for providing a platform for writers with off-beat ideas and attitudes, for completely independent editorial views. Your trial subscription will include such provocative articles as

- **Herbert Lehman's** critical analysis of the role of American liberals
- **William Shannon's** portrait of Pennsylvania's Senator Joseph Clark
- **O. Edmund Clubb's** exclusive reports from Asia and North Africa
- **Milton Mayer's** "Confessions of a Non-Anti-Communist"

. . . plus scores of top notch features on art, the stage, the cinema, nature and the outdoors, medicine, television, and books.

Try The Progressive and see for yourself why Washington Commentator Edward P. Morgan finds it "the liveliest, most stimulating publication I know."

William O. Douglas: The Progressive is a vital force for social justice.

Walter Reuther: One of the few magazines that fights for real democracy.

Wayne Morse: A great liberal force . . . bold, fearless, and truthful.

Patrick Murphy Malin: In the field of civil liberties, a subject marked by confusion and fear, The Progressive comes as a great relief.

Founded 1909 by Robert M. LaFollette, Sr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED